

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants have carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-10 and 21-30 in the application. The Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-10 and 21-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Williamson. As the Examiner is no doubt aware, determination of obviousness requires consideration of the invention considered as a whole; the inquiry is not whether each element exists in the prior art, but whether the prior art made obvious the invention as a whole. Furthermore, there must be some suggestion or teaching in the art that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claimed invention; a reference that teaches away from a claimed invention strongly indicates nonobviousness.

Moreover, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure.

The Examiner has cited Williamson as disclosing two interleaved helical coils (relative to upper and lower E-core halves), such that when the core halves are mated and secured together, the coils are compressed, thereby being inherently springable and biased. (Col. 6, Lines 30-33) The Examiner implies that the coil reaction to the *compression* of the Williamson coils is analogous to the biasing to *unwind* the coil terminus of the presently Claimed Invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner's attention is directed to the definitions of "compress" *i.e.*, "to press or squeeze together" and "unwind" *i.e.*, "to cause to uncoil, unroll." (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Edition) It is clear from Williamson's Figure 13 that the *compression* referred to is *along* the longitudinal/central axis of the coils, while the biasing to unwind the presently Claimed Invention is rotational *around*, and not along, the longitudinal/central axis of the analogous coils. Furthermore, the Examiner's attention is directed to Williamson in referring to FIGURE 2 which reads:

"The apparent indentations or generally inwardly extending arcuate regions 19, 20 account for the offsets of the tabs from tangents to the central opening 18, such that the arcuate regions 19, 20 may *accommodate* the vertical edges 24, 25 (FIG. 4) of the core outer leg arcuate portions 30, 31 (FIG. 5). This permits a *snug fit* (although the spacings are shown exaggerated for clarity) between the coil periphery and the outer leg portions 30, 31." [Emphasis added.] (Column 3, Lines 34-42)

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines "accommodate" as "to make fit, suitable or congruous; to make room for" and "snug" as "to cause to fit closely." Therefore, the "snugness" of

the tabs 15, 16 of Williamson with the outer leg portions 30, 31 of the core can not convey or imply the rotational biasing to *unwind* the coil of the presently Claimed Invention. The snugness of Williamson actually teaches away from biasing to unwind the terminus to *bear against* an underside of the magnetic core of the presently Claimed Invention. Williamson, therefore, fails to teach or suggest the invention recited in independent Claim 1 and the dependent Claims 2-10, when considered as a whole.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-23, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williamson in view of Japanese Patent No. JP 56012714 to Takasaki. Regarding independent Claim 21, the Examiner asserts that Williamson discloses the claimed invention except for the convex portion of the core half. However, as recited above, Williamson fails to teach or suggest the biasing to unwind the terminus to bear against a bottom surface of the magnetic core recited in independent Claim 21.

Williamson, individually or in combination with Takasaki, fails to teach or suggest the invention recited in independent Claims 1 and 21 and their dependent claims, when considered as a whole. Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are therefore not obvious in view of Williamson and Takasaki.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the cited references do not support the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-10 and 21-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-10 and 21-30.

It is not believed that any fees are due for this communication, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any possible fees connected with this communication to Deposit Account No. 08-2395.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.



Richard D. Krobusek
Registration No. 44,851

Dated: July 20, 2004

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800